

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

As originally filed, the present application presented claims 1 through 22 for examination. Claims 1, 9, 17, 18, 20, and 22 were amended in the 1.111 amendment filed on March 7, 2005. Applicants have amended claims 1, 12, 18, 20, and 22 in accordance with the substance of the interview granted by the Examiner on October 5, 2005 (interview summary attached).

By action taken here, Applicants in no way intend to surrender any range of equivalents beyond that needed to patentably distinguish the claimed invention as a whole over the prior art. Applicants expressly reserve all such equivalents that may fall in the range between Applicants' literal claim recitations and combinations taught or suggested by the prior art.

**I. Applicants' Invention**

It is respectfully suggested, as was pointed out during the interview, that the combination of references as presented does not render obvious Applicants' invention in that the combination does not solve the problem which Applicants sought to overcome. Specifically, Applicants sought to provide a single mirror surface comprising two mirror elements or segments, which operate in cooperation one with the other to provide a single planar surface during normal vehicle operation; and, a rearward directed mirror element and a downward directed mirror element during backing. The relationship between the two mirror elements or segments is such that one element pivots or rotates with respect to the other about an axis formed between the two segments to provide the downward or curb view from one element, during backing, while the other maintains its original position.

**II. Rejection of the Claims**

In the final Office Action the Examiner pointed out that, although Applicants argue the cooperative aspect of the two mirror segments or elements, this functional language was not presented fully in the claims as amended in the previously filed §1.111 response. Specifically, the Examiner noted, in response to Applicants' amendments to the claims and argument, that the cooperative language was not present in the claims. This response, containing the above referenced amended claims, in accordance with the interview, corrects this oversight.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9-14, and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scifres (US 4022520) in view of Vu (US 4890907).

Further, the Examiner rejected claims 7, 8, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scifres in view of Vu as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of either McDonough (US 5052792) or JP 58-4647 (JP'647).

### III. Argument

The Examiner has withdrawn his original objection to the drawings. As was pointed out during the interview, the reference Vu (US 4890907), relied upon to show the downward movement of a separately housed mirror element, does not show the pivoting of the two mirror elements about their common axis as now presented in the amended claims. Thus, Vu cannot provide a single planar reflective surface while the vehicle is in normal operating mode.

As is set out in Applicants' Application at paragraph 0023,

“The outside, remote rear-view mirror system presents the driver an efficient, full, rear-view during normal driving operations from both mirror elements, in tandem, as if they were a single reflective surface. Thus, during normal driving, i.e. not backing up, the mirror elements act as a standard exterior rearview mirror. In this mode, even though the mirror elements can move independently, they can be adjusted in a conventional manner as a single reflective surface. During backing, however, one surface is tilted to view, for example, the curb, while the other remains in its previous position providing the driver an efficient rear-view. Upon completion of the backing maneuver, the reflective surface that has been tilted to view the curb, returns to its previous position such that both surfaces once again present the driver an efficient, full, single rear-view. In this manner the driver, while backing can see both the normal rearward view, as well as the downward view.” (Emphasis added)

Further, as set forth in the drawings, in order to accomplish the above, one element pivots or rotates with respect to the other along an axis formed between the elements (see Figure 2). As shown in Figure 3, the driver has a full planar view using both of the elements, but the lower element moves or “pivots” about the common axis or interface upon placing the vehicle in reverse (Figure 4). Thus, there is support in the specification for the amendments made herein to the claims.

### IV. Conclusion

In accordance with the interview, Applicants have amended all the claims to incorporate the cooperation of the two mirror elements during normal conditions, and those during backing wherein the second mirror segment pivots or moves about an axis formed by the two elements

to provide a downward (curbside) view by the second mirror element, while the first mirror element maintains its rearward view.

Early and favorable action is requested.

Date: October 10, 2005

Reg. No.: 27,216  
Tel. No.: 720-870-5845  
**USPTO Customer No. 36178**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Practitioner

Lee G. Meyer  
Meyer & Associates, LLC  
17462 E. Powers Drive  
Centennial, CO 80015-3046

1.111 Amendment.doc 50089.0001